Indonesia - Green Prosperity: Cocoa Grant Portfolio

Report generated on: February 22, 2018

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Indonesia

EVALUATION TITLE
Green Prosperity: Cocoa Grant Portfolio

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-IDN-GP-COCOA-2018-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
- v01: Edited, anonymous dataset for public distribution.

Overview

ABSTRACT
The purpose of the performance evaluation is to understand the degree to which the Window 1 grants under the Green Prosperity Cocoa portfolio are meeting the objectives of the portfolio and to generate learning surrounding the implementation of these grants to date. Evaluation Questions are:

1) To what extent have the GP Cocoa grants' (Cocoa Revolution, SCPP and EQSI) training approaches proven successful in improving farmers' knowledge, attitudes and practice of GAP/GEP?

What have been the most effective training approaches in GAP/GEP and why? (comparison of approaches among the 3 grants, curricula

How are beneficiaries targeted under each grant? Do participants have equitable access to training and activities?

How have GAP/GEP principles and measures been applied or adopted by trainees after training? What are adoption rates and what contributes to adoption rates?

What are enabling or constraining factors to training efficacy?

2) How has each grant progressed in achieving its short and medium-term outcomes (phase 1) and long-term outcomes (phase 2)?

What are perceptions in & documented changes to income, management/financial practices, product quality and value chain integration?

What are perceptions in & documented changes in access to supplies/land, markets and knowledge?

What methods are used to verify and document the number of participants trained, number of hectares of sustainable product, fertilizer use and farm yields?

What are enabling or constraining factors to any of the above areas (2a-c)?

What challenges or limitations exist in timely verification/documentation, validity, and confounding factors for monitoring data?

3) What evidence is there that results or outcomes of the GP Cocoa grants will be further scaled and sustainable, and what results appear to be less sustainable? Why?

What are the exit strategies for each grant?

What role do global market trends or priorities play in considering sustainability?

To what extent have grants engaged key actors and entities in ensuring sustainability- who are key actors, what is their role and what type of support will they need after the project ends?

What factors have been identified that will enable continued success for farmers and smallholders, including key strategies or approaches (certification, fermentation, incentives)? What challenges or limitations may affect sustainability of grant outcomes?

4) What aspects of the GP Cocoa grant approaches have proven to be most relevant in meeting the needs of the Indonesian cocoa sector?

Have grantees received any feedback from companies, farmer associations, co-ops and GOI? What is done with this feedback?

Are there any notable considerations for activity implementation within specific regional or demographic areas?

To what extent can M&E practices/systems provide useful data for future programming or activity assessments?

To what extent do inclusion in organizations, KUD, etc. affect farmer learning and earning outcomes?

What, if any, lessons, practices or successes can be applied to other value chains and to MCC and/or other private and public stakeholders' work in (or outside of) the cocoa sector?

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Other (Performance Evaluation)

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
individuals, farming associations, project staff

KIND OF DATA
Administrative records data [adm]

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Agriculture	MCC Sector	
Cocoa		
Indonesia		

KEYWORDS
Agriculture, Cocoa, Indonesia

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
The evaluation team selected the provinces of Southeast Sulawesi, South Sulawesi, West Sulawesi and West Sumatra as target provinces due to the high numbers of cocoa farming households and participating farmers and also to cover the main GP-SCPP implementation "clusters." GP-SCPP implementation clusters are strategies tied to particular locations (provinces) where the private sector partners working with GP-SCPP in that location sign up to a particular approach and agreed to work together

UNIVERSE
Selection of districts was purposive, aimed at representing the major regions of the national cocoa production areas, and all of the grants involved in the Cocoa portfolio. The GP Project identified and selected 13 provinces which were eligible for the GP Facility grants. Additionally, 24 districts within these provinces were identified by MCA-Indonesia as having favorable project development characteristics for the cocoa partnership grants. As the major cocoa growing region in Indonesia, the

main geographic focus of the three cocoa grants is in Sulawesi. SCPP is the largest of the three grants, not only in financial size but also in geographic diversity. The SCPP grant conducts activities in four districts in East Nusa Tenggara, two districts in Southeast Sulawesi, two districts in South Sulawesi, two districts in West Sumatra and four districts in West Sulawesi. Cocoa Revolution conducts activities in one district in Southeast Sulawesi and one district in South Sulawesi, where it overlaps activity areas with SCPP. EQSI manages activities in three districts of Southeast Sulawesi, and does not overlap with either of the other grants.

The study population includes farmers, buying station and fermentation center representatives, farmer cooperatives and associations, MCC/MCA-I project staff, grantees, field staff, goverment representatives, project management and private sector partners.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Social Impact	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-IDN-GP-COCOA-2018-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Indonesia Compact

MCC SECTOR
Finance, Investment, and Trade (FIT)

Sampling

Study Population

Selection of districts was purposive, aimed at representing the major regions of the national cocoa production areas, and all of the grants involved in the Cocoa portfolio. The GP Project identified and selected 13 provinces which were eligible for the GP Facility grants. Additionally, 24 districts within these provinces were identified by MCA-Indonesia as having favorable project development characteristics for the cocoa partnership grants. As the major cocoa growing region in Indonesia, the main geographic focus of the three cocoa grants is in Sulawesi. SCPP is the largest of the three grants, not only in financial size but also in geographic diversity. The SCPP grant conducts activities in four districts in East Nusa Tenggara, two districts in Southeast Sulawesi, two districts in South Sulawesi, two districts in West Sumatra and four districts in West Sulawesi. Cocoa Revolution conducts activities in one district in Southeast Sulawesi and one district in South Sulawesi, where it overlaps activity areas with SCPP. EQSI manages activities in three districts of Southeast Sulawesi, and does not overlap with either of the other grants. The study population includes farmers, buying station and fermentation center representatives, farmer cooperatives and associations, MCC/MCA-I project staff, grantees, field staff, goverment representatives, project management and private sector partners.

Sampling Procedure

The Cocoa Revolution program is only implemented in two districts, both of which are included in the evaluation. The EQSI program works in three districts, two of which are included in the evaluation. Four out of 10 GP-SCPP districts in the selected province have been selected including two which overlap with the other project. Because of its larger scope and large number of project partners and clusters, more fieldwork is to be conducted at the GP-SCPP sites.

The individuals selected for key informant interviews includes those working in key positions for project stakeholders including project staff (management and technical staff), government (Bappeda and Department of Agriculture representatives), private sector partners, buyers and local community leaders. They were selected purposively based on comprehensive contact lists and input received from grantees and from MCC and MCA-I regarding appropriateness and level of project involvement. Project reports were also used to identify the key actors. .For beneficiary FGDs and the mini-survey, in each district two farmer groups were randomly selected from a complete list of all farmer groups in each selected district. Each group selected represented a different sub district and project field staff assisted the ET with contacting each farmer for recruitment for the FGD. The sample unit for the FGDs and the mini-survey was the farmer household represented by the farmer.

Questionnaires

Overview

The questionnaires for the project staff interviews were semi-structured guides that were strictly qualitative (open-ended). A questionnaire was given to project staff including field staff and management staff and collected sex, title, and interview date and location. The questionnaire included perceptions of training approaches, government priorities, progression towards meeting indicator targets and sustainability. Questionnaires were also delivered to staff at fermentation centers and cocoa buying stations to ask about post harvest handling and perceptions to cocoa quality during the course of the projects.

The questionnaires were all developed and utilized in English.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2017-09-18	2017-10-21	N/A

Data Collection Notes

The ET will conduct KIIs and facilitate FGDs in Bahasa Indonesia since most of the farmers are fluent and at least have completed primary school. The ET members include a Team Leader, Cocoa Sector Specialist, Jr. Analyst and Cocoa Research Coordinator. The team will divide into two teams of two in the same selected district in order to minimize the risk of unprecedented issues being faced by a team member. Each team will have one Indonesian member to maximize local knowledge. Ten beneficiaries will participate in each FGD. At each meeting one team member will interview/facilitate and the other will take notes. There will be a total of 56 KIIs conducted, with an estimate of no less than 32 KIIs with SCPP stakeholders,12 KIIs with EQSI and 12 KIIs with CR. A estimated 160 farmers will be reached through FGDs. Data collection will take place over a 5 week period from September 15 through October 21, with the evalaution team working Monday through Saturday.

The ET will take notes during data collection and digitally word process these daily to ensure that all important statements and ideas are captured. Additionally, all interviews will be recorded with the permission of the interviewee, and the notes will aid in transcription and analysis following each interview. Completed recordings will be uploaded and saved securely on the Team Leader's external hard drive. For the mini survey, each team member will interview a group of five farmers to self-administer the survey (totaling 10 respondents for each of the two teams). Data collection will be paper based. After completion, the ET member will check the survey for consistency and where there are issues will check with farmers on the spot. A guide will be prepared for issues/problems to look out for in checking surveys. Data collected will be entered into a spreadsheet at the end of each day of field work for ease of analysis.
The instruments (KII guides, FGD guides, mini survey instrument and direct observation protocols) will be translated into Bahasa and piloted in Makassar prior to field travel to check for comprehensibility for beneficiaries, logical flow and time required.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires for the project staff interviews were semi-structured guides that were strictly qualitative (open-ended). A questionnaire was given to project staff including field staff and management staff and collected sex, title, and interview date and location. The questionnaire included perceptions of training approaches, government priorities, progression towards meeting indicator targets and sustainability. Questionnaires were also delivered to staff at fermentation centers and cocoa buying stations to ask about post harvest handling and perceptions to cocoa quality during the course of the projects.

The questionnaires were all developed and utilized in English.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Throughout site visits the ET will collect data in real time, analyzing findings on a daily basis to determine emerging trends in order to aggregate findings around common themes. SI will use content and comparative analysis to identify response categories and patterns and identify emergent themes and contextual factors. Following the conclusion of data collection, the PE will aggregate data obtained from the KIIs and FGDs around common themes related to the four EQs. For quantitative Mini-Survey data, the ET will input data electronically on a regular basis throughout data collection and will conduct basic analysis to identify any emerging trends, such as frequency distribution and subgroup comparison via cross-tabulation. Data analysis will tabulate responses and disaggregate data, as possible, by project, private sector partner, region, and gender, to understand what changes occurred and how this might have varied among beneficiary groups. SI will analyze data obtained by FGDs by project, location, and gender to capture any differing perspectives of grant approaches and experiences among groups. KIIs will analyze key themes identified by stakeholders. As the three grants have widespread and differing budgets and implementation strategies, this comparison will include any trends, similarities or differences in efficacy related to geographic distribution, training and overall achievement of program outcomes to date. On questions of effectiveness, data analysis will examine how and why changes occurred and if experiences varied among sub-groups (EQ1). Looking more broadly through the value chain the team will look at how the projects combined support for different areas and brought different actors together to bring about the TOC (EQ2). The ET will also look at how the different stakeholders perceive the likelihoods of sustainability (EQ3) and what are the key innovations and ways of operating that can constitute lessons learned from each projects (EQ4). Several data analysis methods that may be used are listed below:
1. Content Analysis- Content analysis will entail the ET's intensive review of KII and FGD data to identify and highlight notable examples of the projects' successes (or lack of successes) that contributed to or did not contribute to the Activity's goal and objectives.
2. Trend Analysis - Trend analysis will enable the ET to examine different project indicators over time to identify patterns of convergence (or divergence) of activity outputs and outcomes toward the stated objectives.
3. Gender Analysis - the ET will similarly capture and compare the results of the program as it specifically benefited (or did not benefit) women and men. All data collected through its KIIs, FGDs, and mini-surveys will be disaggregated by gender and analyzed for effects on female beneficiaries.
Mixed methods analysis will be sequential and parallel to both identify emerging issues and to strengthen the reliability of findings. Ongoing data analysis throughout the fieldwork will indicate any emergent issues for further exploration in future KIIs or FGDs, particularly for unintended outcomes. The ET will also triangulate monitoring (if provided) and Mini-Survey data with its qualitative findings to ensure the credibility and reliability of findings through a systematic and rigorous data analysis approach and analytical depth and nuance. Through this use of qualitative data, the team will examine questions of how or why activities were perceived successful or not, including for key groups such as women, and compare stakeholder perceptions of issues such as challenges to efficacy or how project activities affected stakeholder relationships.
Regarding sustainability, the ET will take into consideration how well the cocoa grants align with GoI policy on sustainable agriculture or cocoa, and how national or local government policy or procedures may have contributed to or hindered results, as well as how that contribution bodes for future work in the cocoa sector in the country. Analysis for Phase 2 data will specifically look to address broader long-term outcomes of grant approaches as noted in EQ2, including analyzing contributors to overall improved natural resource management (efficacy of specific grant approaches and cross tabulation of supporting data on tree planting, yields and fertilizer use) and overall improved incomes (efficacy of specific grant approaches and cross tabulation of supporting data on farmer costs, farm size, certification and traceability and adoption rates). Disaggregation of all data for analysis will be by farmer type (i.e. newly trained vs. formerly trained farmers), KI type (i.e. managerial/project staff, buying stations, government), gender of respondents where available, and geographic location of respondent. For comparison between grants, the ET will also disaggregate data by grantee

Other Processing

Mini surveys will be distributed in paper copy and then results will be typed into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet for analysis. All evaluation team members will have laptops in the field.

Data Appraisal

No content available